THEOLOGY

VOL. LI APRIL, 1948 NO. 334

Editorial

THERE are not, we imagine, very many readers of THEOLOGY who are so constituted that they will respond with alacrity to an appeal to become "publicity-minded." *Church Information* (being the Report of the Publicity Commission appointed pursuant to a resolution of the Church Assembly[1]) does not seem to have been received with much enthusiasm anywhere, and the summaries of it that at first appeared gave the impression that its purport was to recommend the spending of a large sum of money annually on the development of another piece of central ecclesiastical bureaucracy. It can hardly be denied that the Report does make a recommendation to that effect, though it is not stated in those words. But perhaps it should be counted for righteousness to the Commissioners that they succeeded, though with obvious difficulty, in resisting the temptation to recommend immediately the expenditure on an advertising campaign of a much vaster sum than a mere annual £14,000. They came to the conclusion that an appeal should not be made for such a purpose "when the Church is already making an urgent appeal for money for the maintenance and extension of its work and for the provision of a living wage for its clergy."

Nevertheless, they felt justified in recommending the formation of a Church Information Board with a wide range of functions. Of these functions it seems to us that only one can be regarded as necessary. We agree with the finding of the Commission that the Church of England ought to have a means of supplying the metropolitan press with reliable information about ecclesiastical affairs. It ought, in fact, to have a more efficient and serviceable means of doing so than the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly. This job ought to be done well or not to be attempted, and it could be done better without any additional expenditure. There are various ways in which this courteous service might be rendered to the press, and it would be interesting to learn how other Churches render it. If the Commission collected information on this subject, it has not found its way into the Report. Anyhow, nothing so elaborate or costly as the proposed Church Information Board is needed for this purpose.

The other proposed functions of the Board appear to us either to be of dubious value in themselves or not to be so urgent as other things that need to be done or to be capable of being better discharged in other ways. The fundamental fact to be borne in mind is that the Church of England has at least one full-time agent in every parish or group of parishes throughout the country, and that he has the assistance

[1] Press and Publications Board. 3s.

of a parochial church council and of other willing helpers. This constitutes an actual or potential means of making the Gospel known beside which any organization of publicity in London must be inconsiderable. What the Church Assembly ought to be doing is to set the parish priests free from the burdens, anxieties and distractions which at present make it difficult for them to devote themselves unrestrictedly to the evangelistic and pastoral work for which they were ordained. No relief is afforded to them by the prospect or by the contemplation of a further piling up of expensive organization in London, but much the reverse. Whatever little good this might do would be conditional upon an antecedent improvement of conditions in the parishes. It is personal evangelists that are needed, not impersonal evangelism.

It is only fair to add that the Report contains some useful suggestions about what might be done through local instruments of publicity, the provincial press, parish magazines, etc. In some places much enterprise is shown already in the use of these instruments. Similar enterprise, the more varied the better, might be shown in other places, but we doubt whether the promptings of a Board in London would do much to stimulate it.

But when all is said and done, a much more searching inquiry ought to be made into the question whether the Church can rightly make use of modern means of publicity for the propagation of the Gospel; at any rate, some deeper principle of discrimination is required than has yet been discovered. "When truth conquers with the help of 10,000 yelling men," said Kierkegaard, "even supposing that that which is victorious is a truth: with the form and manner of the victory a far greater untruth is victorious."[1] When do advertising and other forms of publicity become equivalent to yelling men?

The Theology of Christian Initiation (being the Report of a Theological Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to advise on the relations between Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion)[2] is good so far as it goes. It is balanced, judicious and appropriately tentative. But it is disappointingly slight. We had hoped that this Commission would take its time and at last produce something really substantial. We infer from the introductory note that it was pressed to conclude its work well before the Lambeth Conference. We hope that the Lambeth Conference will realize that much more theological work needs to be done on this subject and will take steps to see that it is undertaken. It is significant of the extent to which the Church is unprepared that, while four or five out of the fifteen members of this Commission have in the past written articles or pamphlets on some aspect of Christian Initiation, the Archbishops were not able to call upon a single theologian who has written a book on the subject. We badly need a *magnum opus*, if not *magna opera*, which will treat of initiation within a total theology of the Holy Spirit and the Church and will press *au fond* questions that are here scarcely touched.

[1] *Journals*, p. 234.

[2] S.P.C.K. 1s.

The Church in Wales

THE index of a great book on English social history twice bids us turn to a certain page for information about Welsh Disestablishment. On doing so, we find the information confined to a participial clause: "the Establishment, though shorn of its Irish and Welsh excrescences, maintains its endowments . . ." The purpose of the present article, composed on the request of the Editor and his advisory committee, is to explain what has become of the Welsh excrescence since what seemed at the time the abhorred shears were applied in 1920.

Not every historian would regard it as just to speak of the Church in Wales as an excrescence of the Church of England. Most Welsh Churchmen have grown up to think of their community as one which stands in direct succession to those remnants of Romano-British Christianity which still existed at least in Wales when St Augustine came to Canterbury; whose bishops found the apostle of the English somewhat lofty and unsympathetic, and refused to co-operate with him;[1] and whose saints and leaders have left their names to countless villages and churches in Wales as in Cornwall. Whatever the obscurities of that early Age of the Saints—and the death of Dr Gilbert Doble has removed our best hope of settling the value of their almost worthless *Lives*—there is topographical reason for believing that the Cambro-British Church, though to Bede's regret it failed to help in the conversion of its English neighbours, yet carried through a great spiritual revival in its own land uninfluenced by the Augustinian mission. At what stage the Welsh Church came into fraternization with the English, and at what stage bishops in different parts of Wales began to receive consecration at Canterbury, are questions of debate which must not be debated here.[2] Doubtless the process was helped forward by the adoption of the "Roman" Easter, an event associated in the only evidence we possess with Elfodd, a North Wales saint, and with the year 768;[3] and Asser, King Alfred's Welsh-born bishop of Sherborne, is a significant figure in it. Complete unity between Wales and the Province of Canterbury seems to have waited until the irregular advance of the Norman conquest, in which Norman nominees occupied the sees now fixed at Bangor, Llandaff and St Davids between 1093 and 1120. Even then much Welsh sentiment, and some Welsh usages, appear to have survived until the conquest under Edward I, and even the union under Henry VIII. As Sir Maurice Powicke has written, "Welsh racial consciousness seems to be able to thrive apart from political form."[4] What took place was not the pullulation of an excrescence: it was more like what happened in the famous dream of Edward the Confessor in which the two parts of a split tree were seen to meet and grow together.

---

[1] Bede, *H.E.*, II, ii.

[2] Reference may be made to J. Conway Davies in *Welsh Episcopal Acts*, 1066-1272, No. 1, Vol. 1, 1946, of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales, pp. 55-66.

[3] J. E. Lloyd, *History of Wales*, i, 203.

[4] *Medieval England* (H.U.L.), p. 20.

"The protection which the Church in Wales thus gained more than compensated it for the loss of abstract status."[1] For eight centuries the Church in Wales shared in the various enactments, compositions and customs which constitute the establishment of the English Church, and in due course it participated in the post-Reformation settlements. If we may judge from the ordinations and institutions recorded in such episcopal registers as have been printed, the regular parochial work was always performed by an overwhelming preponderance of Welshmen bearing Welsh names, who must at all times have maintained its Welsh characteristics. Prominent among those characteristics has ever been comparative financial stringency, reflected alike in the fact that in the thirteenth century the minimum stipend of five marcs a year allotted to a perpetual vicar in England could not be imposed in Wales,[2] and in the smallness of the fabrics of the cathedrals and other ancient major churches. A glance at a modern road-map tells the same tale as a glance at a distribution-map of monasteries or friaries in the Middle Ages, of a country beautiful indeed but poor and sparsely populated and incapable of supporting a wealthy establishment. It is only in the last century, and in the south-eastern counties of Glamorgan and Monmouth with their mixture of nationalities, that wealth and population have increased. Yet there is evidence of a strong piety in the Age of the Saints, in the twelfth century of Giraldus Cambrensis, and in later times; and neither then nor now, as will appear, can the absence of grandiose cathedral churches and of apparently luxurious closes be taken as evidence of spiritual poverty. Poor as the land was, however, disendowment began early, through the appropriation of Welsh tithe by the Norman lords to the great monasteries of the English borderland; and there are signs that sinecures and cathedral offices, though often manned by local worthies, frequently went during six of these centuries to make up the incomes of non-Welsh pluralists. This is even truer of the bishoprics. Down to about 1300, and again in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (when Bishop Richard Davies and Bishop William Morgan produced the great Welsh Bible) the bishops were fairly commonly men of local sympathy and understanding; but in other periods, right down to the second half of the nineteenth century, they were mainly Englishmen, notable for what were from time to time the fashionable qualities of prelates. The great relative growth of nonconformity in the modern period has sometimes been ascribed to this unsympathetic leadership. It has to be remembered, however, that there was a similar growth in "Celtic" Cornwall and in the industrial North; and, without defending what on that scale was indefensible, it is fair to observe that when the age of pluralism was gone and the Victorian revival began, great advances were made in all the Welsh dioceses under the leadership of men bearing such English names as Thirlwall, Copleston and Ollivant, Cotton and Vowler Short. By the end of the nineteenth century great leaders who were native Welshmen had been planted everywhere, though at that

[1] J. W. James, *A Church History of Wales*, 1945, p. 74.
[2] J. R. H. Moorman, *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century*, p. 45, (from Wilkins).

time the principality still gained something from the fact that college patronage and other circumstances brought in English priests as various and as gifted as Francis Kilvert, Dr Allan Smith (and other vicars of Swansea), Dr G. C. Joyce, Dr Hermitage Day, Canon H. R. Johnson, first warden of St Michael's Theological College (1892), and others. Thus the ancient Church was both hindered and helped in bearing its characteristic fruit by being grafted into the English stock.

At the time of Disestablishment both the Church and nonconformity counted for much in the life of Wales. The picture sometimes given of a land in which "the chapel" dominates everything and the Church is unnoticed is a misleading picture. The impression can be explained by the fact that in many regions the gaunt chapels are a feature of the landscape noticeable to visitors, as are the people carrying Bibles on Sunday evenings who are heard to remark "Our man was good to-night." Nonconformity indeed has had a great influence, political, cultural and religious; and it is very noticeable because it takes the place often taken elsewhere by indifference. The Royal Commission of 1910 found it exceedingly difficult to get sound figures for comparison, as the terms "communicant," "member," "adherent," were used in different senses by different bodies, and the numbers differently computed. It has also to be remembered that the "Easter communicants" of any single year may be misleading, owing to variations in weather, health, holiday migration and so on. The general impression received was that, strong as were the other bodies taken together, the Church was still the strongest single "denomination." What clearly appears is that numerically in relation to the entire population the Church was as strong in Wales as in England, though in proportion to the total Christian forces of the country it was less; but that was simply because in Wales a far larger proportion of the population were practising Christians. It was found that while over all the Church of England provided "seating accommodation" for 22 per cent of the total population, in Wales the Church provided seating for 22·8, and nonconformity had seating for 74 per cent of the population, which the Commissioners regarded as "greatly in excess of the number of persons who may be expected to avail themselves of it." The C. of E. communicant figures tell a similar story: for England and Wales together they were alleged to be 6·28 per cent of population; for the whole of Wales (including the populous south-east and the strongly nonconformist north-west) they were slightly higher, namely 6·66; the largely rural dioceses of St Davids and St Asaph each had 8·64. The actual figures give Wales a population of 2,012,876 in 1901, and an average of Easter communicants for the three years 1906-08 of about 136,327. It was believed that about 66 per cent of existing "communicants" actually communicated at a given Easter. The total of "communicants" for 1906, for what it may be worth—and it seems to be the fairest figure to compare with attendants at communion elsewhere—was for the C. of E. 193,081 and for the nonconformists 550,280, the largest number being that of "Congregationalists and Independents" with 157,147. The Sunday School figures for Wales are also given: under 15 years of age the Church claimed 112,698 and the

chapels 328,878; over 15, owing to the great activity of the Adult Sunday School, the chapels could claim the great preponderance of 281,857 to 56,088.

It may be convenient to state at once the comparative figures, as well as they are known, for the Church in the years just before the last war. The population in 1931 was 2,583,930, and the Easter communicants for 1936-38 averaged 195,323, or about 7·6 of the population. Thus in the years just before the war the Church had more than kept pace with the growth in population as compared with its achievement thirty years before. The actual number of persons confirmed rose from an average of 11,075 for the years 1896 to 1905 to an average of 14,335 for the years 1936-38. On the other hand the number of Sunday School pupils for those years had dropped to about 104,000 under and 35,000 over 15. All this does not lead us very far, for lack of comparative figures.[1] It is probably true to say that the total relative amount of Christian profession and religious practice is still appreciably greater than in England; and that the proportion of churchmanship to the whole is at least as high as it was. It is often said that church-going is out of fashion to-day. The change in fashion has undoubtedly touched Wales. But Wales has always been slow—ever since the Stone Age, archæologists tell us—to accept new fashions, good or bad; and it is not unknown for a Welsh clergyman, deploring his poor congregations, to be told by English visitors that his numbers are good.

To return to Disestablishment. Although much acrimony had accompanied the long political struggle, during which bills had been defeated several times in the 1870's and 1890's, the provisions of the Act which was passed by the Commons in 1914, and received the Royal Assent under the Parliament Act of 1911, appear (apart from what might have been crippling financial provisions) to be intended to liberate the Church as much as to destroy privilege. The first provision abolishes the power of the Crown, as of other patrons, to appoint or nominate to any ecclesiastical office; then every cathedral or ecclesiastical corporation, sole or aggregate, is dissolved; no bishop of the Church in Wales as such is to sit or vote as a lord of Parliament, but no person is disqualified from the House of Commons by reason of having been ordained priest or deacon if the ecclesiastical office he holds or last held be in the Church in Wales; ecclesiastical courts in Wales and Monmouthshire cease to exercise any jurisdiction, and the ecclesiastical law of the Church in Wales ceases to exist as law, but the ecclesiastical law and ordinances of the Church of England (subject to modification by the Church in Wales) are binding on members as if they had agreed to be so bound, and can be enforced in the temporal courts, and the Church in Wales may provide in its constitution for ecclesiastical courts with appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury's court but not to

[1] A recent chart of the Bureau of Current Affairs suggests that of the major denominations of England and Wales, as between 1925 and 1946, the Church of Rome alone has numerically increased and the Church in Wales alone held its own; but this is based on the confusing " adult or communicant members " claimed for those two particular years.

the King in Council; bishops and clergy of the Church in Wales must cease to be members of or represented in the Convocation of Canterbury, though the bishops, clergy and laity can hold their own synods in such manner as they think fit, and frame regulations, and manage their own property. Property to be retained by the Church included all property derived from private resources since 1662 (the year at which churchmanship, as a distinct thing, was deemed to begin, though actually the great secession of Methodists was not complete till 1810). It also included all churches and ecclesiastical residences, with their books and chattels, together with funds specially allocated to their upkeep, an action justified not only by sentiment but by the fact that the Commission had found that since 1840 voluntary contributions for the rebuilding or restoration of such buildings had totalled £3,332,385.

What harm, and what good, have accrued to the Church in Wales by Disestablishment? These are questions about which a man can write only as he feels. To take the harm first: it is almost all traceable to the fact of dismemberment and severance from the Church of England, which is an aspect of Disestablishment only because it arises mainly from the withdrawal of the privilege of membership of Convocation. That had all along been the fear of the Welsh bishops and of Archbishop Davidson, and it was only reluctantly that they accepted the fact that the formation of a new province was essential to due orderliness and smoothness of working.[1] It was at that time the intention that only such severance should be made as the Act required. Time has inevitably caused the severance to increase as interests have diverged and as the prelates who had been accustomed to work together as colleagues in the same province have passed away. Thus Dr Davidson and Dr Lang deemed it right after 1924 to offer honorary degrees to Welsh diocesans simply *iure dignitatis* as to English ones; but appearance now suggests that the practice has been changed. The position of the Church in Wales under the lee of her great neighbour is indeed, it must be confessed, sometimes rather confusing and uncomfortable: we do not seem to fall into any known category, as Home Church, Free Church or Mission Field. To some English councils we send members, to some observers or assessors, to some nobody at all. Occasionally we get forgotten altogether. This sometimes saves us from answering troublesome questions; but sometimes bother and vexation can be caused, as when important war regulations affecting ordinands failed to be imparted. The Church Assembly Marriage Measure of 1930, allowing citizens in England to be married in a parish where neither resides provided that one of them is on the electoral roll, could not be applied by the Assembly to Wales, and it cannot be so applied by our own synodical action. More serious, if less vexatious, is the comparative cutting off of a small province from the light and leading of a great one. The Church in Wales has only one small college of university standing, Lampeter, founded in 1826; and it has no full-time canonries. True we can still send students to the older universities (or, indeed, to the Welsh University); English

[1] G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson* (1935), pp. 640-41, 86-90.

leaders are often kind in accepting invitations to visit us, and the Community of the Resurrection has lately opened a small priory in Cardiff; we can buy such books as are allocated to our remoteness, if we order them quickly enough, and we have some studious clergy. True, again, and be it gratefully acknowledged, that S.P.C.K., and the National Society, and many other societies for the maintenance of the ministry, and for the educational and other assistance of the clergy, can and do work still with us and for us. Welsh diocesan bishops are still by courtesy invited to the private and informal meetings of their English brethren, whereby they gain much. But there is no regular or organic connexion. And it has become rare for an outstanding English clergyman, like those mentioned above, to enter the service of the Church in Wales, though Dean Du Buisson, one of the last to do so, rightly testified to the cordiality with which, despite his Englishry, he was received, as indeed he deserved. A province of this size cannot produce or retain a great number of specialists; and a grave burden of special committee work is apt to be thrown on to a few individuals. Old ecclesiastics, who knew the province in its former state, still echo Archbishop Edwards's view that loss of unity was worse than the loss of endowments.[1]

Yet the benefits which have accrued are very great, and are partly due to this same dismemberment. Sectarian bitterness has died down. The principality has learnt to look upon its archbishop, whether statesman, scholar or pastor, as a very real spiritual head. Moreover, the smallness of the province, in some ways a weakness, is in some ways a great aid to unity and pastoral efficiency. Such unity can never be easy in a land where even now communications are difficult, where two nations have to work together, and where multitudes in the west and north think and pray in a venerable language, unknown to their own south-eastern population, which may be learnt but (despite Thirlwall, that great man and linguist, but unsympathetic diocesan) seldom acceptably mastered after adolescence. Three Church periodicals in Welsh are maintained, the weekly *Y Llan a'r Dywysogaeth* (The Church and the Principality), the monthly *Y Cyfaill Eglwysig* (Church Companion), and the quarterly *Yr Haul* (The Sun); but the only English semi-official periodical is the quarterly organ, called after a flourishing Youth Movement *Cymry'r Groes* (Welshmen of the Cross), which has earned a good name outside the province. A new Welsh hymn-book, encouraged by the Governing Body, is being produced; but though its tune-book, when it comes, is likely to earn respect outside the province, its admirable words edition already published can be appreciated only by a section even in Wales. Further, while party feeling is almost unknown, what must in Anglicanism be regarded as party views have now sufficiently invaded the province to make it doubtful whether major liturgical changes, which the Governing Body possesses the right to make, could in fact be carried through. Nevertheless, as time has gone on, unity and collaboration have done much. In hours of stress the Church has shown a notable cohesiveness. A new

[1] (A. G. Edwards), *Memories, by the Archbishop of Wales*, pp. 327-31.

and admired constitution, drawn by great Church Lawyers like Lord Sankey and Sir John Banks, was early adopted. Leading churchpeople from all over the country know one another personally. The Governing Body meets once or twice a year at Llandrindod Wells, in which small town there is possible a reunion at the altar and in social ways which greatly eases and oils the machinery of debate and of business, though the problem of enabling the good churchman who is not his own employer to attend has scarcely been solved as yet. The preceding days buzz with the activities of all the usual councils—missions, moral welfare and so on. A system of patronage (bishop, 2 turns; diocesan board, 4 turns; provincial board, 1 turn) has been worked out; and if it sometimes makes mistakes, it is at least wiser and fairer than the previous collection of ancient usages and rights, which could not be called a system at all. Bishops are elected by a college of 47, bishops, clergymen and laymen, representing all the dioceses, with double representation for the vacant see. The dioceses of St Davids, vast in area, and of Llandaff, vast in population, were early divided; consequently there are now six dioceses, without "suffragan bishops" (though with one bilingual assistant bishop), and with an average of 162 incumbencies each, a state of affairs which seems to enable people to see their diocesan as much as they ought without overworking him; probably few people would vote either for a reversion to enormous dioceses or for advance to a state in which bishops are as plentiful as rural deans. In these circumstances, favouring as they do personal collaboration, there have been fruitful developments in clergy-training, a subject on which the Governing Body has always spent considerable sums of money and individuals and colleges have joined to spend much labour: for many years now, all the men ordained, with rare exceptions, have been graduates, many with good honours degrees, and most with subsequent periods in theological colleges. Of late, also, two annual provincial schools for junior clergy, one in teaching method, one in theoretical matters, have been organized; and there is a good deal of diocesan activity in clergy schools, retreats and the like. Indeed an experienced missioner has written that to the best of his knowledge the Diocese of St Davids is "unique in the Anglican communion" for those kinds of pastoral care of its clergy. All episcopal and capitular records have been deposited in the charge of the National Library at Aberystwyth, and made accessible to students and preserved in admirable conditions; and an Historical Society of the Church in Wales, which with some difficulty has gained sufficient support, has just produced its first learned and important volume. Collaboration, too, has brought it about that the provincial Special Forms of Service for War, etc. (which mercifully cannot be hurried owing to the requirement of two languages), have received praise in quarters where such things are not always praised. Equally, again, the unification of all business affairs in the one office of the Representative Body—the management of dilapidations, the regular quarterly cheque, the wakeful administration of trusts, the central care for legal points, the co-ordination of countless committees, and many other things interlocked—must be generally regarded as a boon. Complex

organization can never be without its dangers; and administrators sometimes murmur that the number and hardness of the rules of procedure is becoming so intricate that sometimes there is more business to find out what procedure should be followed than to follow it when found out; and more seriously, remembering Galatians iv, and considering the lilies of the field, they sometimes worry lest letter should quench spirit and law triumph over faith. But this actually troubles few people, and it troubles nobody all the time: it is probably much less than what we have escaped from; and it would also be much mitigated if means could be found for reprinting the 700-odd pages of the *Provincial Handbook*, issued triennially up to 1939, and for giving it a comprehensive index. Indeed, there is everything to be said for the smooth working of so many things from one office, whose expenses are said to be remarkably low.

If such internal matters seem to bulk large in Welsh Church life to-day, it must be pleaded that twenty-seven years are but a short time for four severed dioceses to build up their own life and strike new root. He would be a bold man who should try to answer from within the question—Does the Church count in national life? But one or two things may be said. In the National Eisteddfod—that wonderful efflorescence of a popular art and a people's devotion, which a man must see before he can begin to understand Wales—the Church is not prominent, though not unrepresented. In the much smaller, but not insignificant, Cambrian Archæological Association, founded a century ago by ecclesiastics, churchmen still supply the bulk of the support which is given to the professional archæologists, who now very rightly take the lead. As acquaintance ripens with Welshmen in public life one is led to the belief that men of some Christian allegiance, who care for the ethics and value the consolations of the Gospel, and say their prayers, are very prevalent in that public life. Public affairs can be influenced in a Christian direction only by co-operation with others, whatever their denomination. Such co-operation can be seen at work in a large variety of ways. The political nonconformist, who maybe honestly thought it his duty to oppose the Church as a distortion of the Gospel, is almost, if not quite, extinct. We still do not see alike on all practical or ethical questions, for we have different presuppositions; but our lines of cleavage in thought do not always coincide with our denominational cleavages. In Wales it is fairly generally understood that no society can be expected to disobey its own standing orders; and in interdenominational efforts we do not expect "interchange of pulpits" or "intercommunion," knowing that they are likely at this stage to retard rather than advance ultimate unity. But we are advancing in mutual understanding and co-operation, for which there is a committee in the principality. And there is still much reverence for the Church as "Yr Hen Fam" (the Old Mother), to which, so long as she does not err with St Augustine by adopting a high attitude of blue-blooded canonicity, a certain leadership is not infrequently accorded as a matter of course. If ejection from the House of Lords has brought some loss of dignity and influence in English life, it does not appear to have had any such effect within Wales. Disestablishment

has not reduced the prestige of the Church in its own land: in many parishes the parson is still welcome to visit and to serve every home; where C. of E. was respected as C. of E., it is respected still; where it was once disliked as privileged, it is perhaps beginning to be valued.

The moral of all this seems to be that there is much to be said for small provinces, provided that they are not too small, and provided that for some purposes they are able to associate on terms of equality with neighbouring provinces.

In eagerness for education this "old and haughty nation" has a good record. The Spens Committee found that, while in England in different places from 4 to 26 per cent of elementary-school pupils proceeded to secondary schools, in Wales the figure was from 17 to 55 per cent, and of these a higher percentage entered a university.[1] For the initiation of the Welsh University at Aberystwyth in 1872, and for the Welsh Intermediate School Act of 1889, the Church must not claim special credit. But it can claim credit for the great expansion of "circulating schools" in the eighteenth century, coupled with the name of Griffith Jones, rector of Llanddowror, and of S.P.C.K., and for a great activity in elementary education in the nineteenth, largely due to the work of the clergy and of the National Society. To-day churchmen assist in the councils of the Welsh University, and in each college there are Church societies for the students, while at Bangor and Cardiff there are Church hostels: would that there were means to found them at Aberystwyth and at Swansea! Strenuous efforts are being made in several dioceses to retain a number of Aided Primary Schools; but the provision of Church Secondary Schools, save in one or two cases, seems likely to prove beyond our resources. Efforts too have to be made to save the two Church Training Colleges. Meanwhile there is effective co-operation in the production of Agreed Syllabuses, one joint county committee having produced what is believed to be the first Agreed Syllabus in religious knowledge for evening classes, and a central committee having made an Agreed Syllabus for primary schools, suitable for adoption in Wales. A large and important report on the whole field of religious education involving certain administrative changes was adopted by the Governing Body in October, 1947.

The topic of disendowment has been deliberately postponed until now. By the Welsh Church Act the ancient parochial endowments passed to the County Councils for various purposes, including the assistance of poor scholars, and the episcopal and cathedral endowments passed to the University of Wales and the National Library, save for certain funds pertaining to the upkeep of fabrics retained by the Church. An Amending Act of 1919, which allowed to the Church the capital value of certain vested interests, reduced the total annual loss of income from £100,000 to £48,000 a year (thus tempering the wind to the shorn excrescence). Even such a loss, falling mainly upon a thousand not over-paid incumbencies, was serious. To compensate, the Church aimed at raising a capital fund for re-endowment of £1,000,000, of which some £700,000 was actually subscribed. It

[1] *Secondary Education*, H.M.S.O., pp. xxxiii, 342.

further imposed a levy on the parishes, always paid in full by the dioceses, totalling £45,000 a year; this was increased in 1945 to £60,000. The entire income was pooled: £9,000 a year was devoted to clergy-training, and there were some other minor outgoings; but very little could be bestowed on cathedrals and the like, and the vast bulk of the income had to be used for the maintenance of 980 incumbents and grants to some 500 assistant curates. By this means a "standard stipend" (which means an average stipend, not counting house, fees, offerings, private endowments since 1920, and other locally raised sums) of £282 was ensured to incumbents. Great business men joined the great lawyers who had come to the rescue of their mother church; the management of investments was placed in their hands; and by 1939 the income of the Representative Body had improved by £100,000 a year, which made possible an improvement in stipends, the doubling of the sum allocated to curates' grants, and the establishment of schemes for clergy pensions, dilapidations and grants to widows. By 1945 the standard stipend had risen to £360, of which 11 per cent came from the contributions of present-day churchmen, the minimum being £300 and the maximum £600. To meet the new troubles due to the fall in the value of money a fresh Reconstruction Scheme was adopted in 1946, under which between 1948 and 1965 the number of incumbencies is to be reduced by various forms of grouping from 980 to 832, and the standard stipend raised by stages to £450. This necessitates an increase in the provincial levy by stages to £145,000; and in the present year, 1948, it leaps up from £60,000 to £110,000. Despite the generous labour and good will of able laymen of both nations—and there is plenty of that—it is plain that much of the odium of grouping must fall to the dignitaries, and much of the labour of money-getting upon the clergy as a whole. When it is remembered that local efforts have in addition to maintain church fabrics, churchyards, schools, and to a large extent assistant curates; when it is remembered that the churches are, in fact, well maintained and kept, and that the upkeep of buildings much handsomer than are needed for the purpose of assembly is an act of witness on behalf of the whole nation; when it is remembered that any plan of development, whether in education, or in the building and beautifying of churches, or in cathedral music or sacred learning, or many other things, cannot be carried out by the most spiritual and ardent without money, and that no one can foresee the end of present financial trends (by which indeed the Church of England itself is partially disendowed); it is small wonder that leaders, who may have held all their lives that if a scheme was of God the means would somehow be found to carry it out, sometimes exclaim with the Wise Man, "The destruction of the poor is their poverty."

At the present time a new anxiety has appeared. The war years reduced the number of clergy seriously; and though a number of good candidates for Holy Orders is coming forward, that number is not yet sufficient to replace the war losses and the recurrent loss from ordinary causes. To-day there are 350 curates where in 1939 there were 470. Meanwhile, whereas normally about 20 clergymen produced and trained in Wales find their way annually to service in England, for the

last two years that rate has been trebled. Whatever Bede may have felt about the Welsh Church, it is contributing handsomely to-day to the conversion of the English. That there should always be some migration is not surprising: the Welsh clergy themselves, in country towns especially, constantly have the trying experience of seeing youngsters, who have shaped well as future churchmen, move away to gain their living. The cause of this suddenly multiplied clerical exodus is doubtless the same as after the first world war: England, having multitudes of vacancies, can offer to youngish clergymen both scope and comparatively comfortable circumstances which Wales cannot offer them; and it is difficult to say that they are wrong to work in that part of the vineyard. Passing few clergymen can expect in Wales that their lines will ever be cast in what educated men would account pleasant surroundings and easy circumstances. The vast majority must be content all their lives either to find their happiness in the loyalty—the wonderful loyalty—and the vitality of congregations in industrial and mining areas, or else to find it where tiny communities of their own folk can be really known and served amid the beauty and interest, annually renewed, of a bold and richly coloured countryside. That is, and must be, the vocation of the Welsh clergy. It remains to be seen whether a sufficiency of men will feel that vocation, and whether circumstances will enable them to be true to it. It is manifest that if the present rate of loss goes on churchmanship and Christianity alike must gravely suffer in a part of Britain to which the country as a whole owes a great deal.

Enough has perhaps been written to convince the Christian reader that the Church in Wales both needs and deserves his sympathy and his prayers.

EDWARD SWANSEA AND BRECON.

Justin Martyr and Confirmation

IT seems to be widely held that Justin Martyr shows no knowledge of what we have come to term "confirmation." The late Mr Tom Thompson, for instance, in his *Offices of Baptism and Confirmation* (Cambridge, 1914, p. 7), says of Justin's account of baptism in the *First Apology* that "it is noticeable that there is no allusion to confirmation." Of the *Dialogue with Trypho* Mr Thompson says nothing at all. The late Abbé J. Tixeront, again, in his exposition of Justin's sacramental ideas, apparently finds no reference to any belief not strictly associated with water-baptism (*Histoire des dogmes*, Paris, 1915, t.1, p. 269). More recently, Professor Oulton, in his article "Second-century Teaching on Holy Baptism," in THEOLOGY of March, 1947, states that Justin and the *Didache* "describe a rite of water-baptism which is complete in itself and appears to be regarded by the writers as such" (p. 88). Professor Oulton's statement is supported by a reference to the *Dialogue*. Dom Gregory Dix, it may be noticed, in his reply to Professor Oulton's article, observes an analogy between Christian and Jewish initiation, as Justin describes the former, but is not concerned to draw analogies between Justin's teaching and the beliefs and practice of a later

Christian period (article "The 'Seal' in the Second Century," in THEOLOGY, January, 1948).

In the case of the *Didache* there can be no dispute. In the case of Justin, on the other hand, there is, perhaps, something still to be said, particularly with reference to passages in the *Dialogue*. It is true enough that, had we no more of Justin than the *Apology*, we might assume that his statements about water-baptism and its meaning were all that he knew or believed about the matter. Even so, the assumption would be unwarranted, unless we had reason to suppose that Justin was dealing as exhaustively as he would for a Christian audience with the matters of which he treats in the *Apology*. And we have no such reason. The point is well made by Dom Gregory Dix in the article already mentioned. "Justin, in his *Apology*," he writes, "is setting out to answer the popular charges against the Christians, including the dangerous charge of 'magic' (*Apology* xiv and xxvi). His whole account of the Christian rites is skilfully adapted to demonstrate the harmlessness of these rites from the point of view of the charges brought against them, and is less naive than appears on the surface" (*op. cit.*, p. 9). We may take it, indeed, that Justin's sketches of Baptism and the Eucharist are so carefully drawn as to present the appearance of being adequate and self-explanatory, and not wholly unfamiliar, to his pagan readers. The depreciatory comment upon a certain similarity between Christian and Mithraic initiation, shrewdly introduced at the end of *Apology* lxvi, was intended no doubt to confirm the impression made by the preceding chapters upon the reader, and to insinuate into his mind the notion that, if he were not disposed to inquire seriously into the claims and tenets of Christianity, he would be correct in classifying it as one more eastern mystery-cult, having as good a title as its seniors and rivals to toleration from the Government.

In the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, Justin's aim is entirely different. He is still a propagandist rather than an academic lecturer, for he is concerned to argue that, if the Jew understands his own religion, he must perceive its incompleteness and recognize in Christianity the completion of Judaism. But the controversy of Christian with Jew, as it involves discussing the true meaning of the Old Testament, so gives the Christian disputant a greater freedom in setting forward his own beliefs than he can allow himself in pleading for tolerant treatment with pagans, few of whom he can have hoped to convert. Here again, however, we cannot expect an exhaustive presentation of the doctrines and beliefs at issue. Nevertheless, we owe a great debt of gratitude to the *Dialogue*, or rather to those who have preserved it through the centuries, in that it reveals to us something of the inwardness of certain of the matters set forth in the *Apology*, and opens others, without Justin's view of which our knowledge of early Christian thought would have been considerably more incomplete than it is. In the case of the Eucharist, for instance, the *Dialogue* presents a sacrificial interpretation of the rite, argued from Lev. xiv, 10 and Mal. i, 10-12, which, probably to avoid misrepresentation, Justin sees fit to omit from the *Apology*.

The *Dialogue* supplements the *Apology*, again, in the case of Baptism. The brief account of Baptism given in *Apology* lxi, followed by the

description of the newly baptized, or "enlightened" (*φωτισθείς*), person's introduction into the Christian assembly, and of the celebration of the Baptismal Eucharist, in lxv, admittedly appears to be complete in itself. Further, Justin's interpretation of the baptism or "washing" contains no word or hint to carry his readers' thoughts beyond the limits of the act itself. The pagan reader, that is to say, who may be expected to regard ideas about remission of sins and regeneration as common religious form, will be led to assume that he has learned from the *Apology* all that is significant concerning Christian initiation. The success of Justin's method may perhaps be measured by Professor Oulton's comment; for while, indeed, Professor Oulton does not omit to refer to the *Dialogue*, his reference is confined to a single sentence, and the weight of his attention is concentrated upon the *Apology*. The sentence which he quotes from the *Dialogue* occurs in ch. xxix. Justin is arguing against the necessity of circumcision, on the ground that God, according to His prophecy, has visited the Gentiles, and accepts sacrifices from them more readily than from the Jews; therefore he asks, "What need have I of that baptism, who have been baptized with holy Spirit?" By "that baptism," Professor Oulton understands circumcision; and that he is right is evident from Justin's immediately preceding question, "What value has circumcision for me now, who have God's testimony in my favour?"[1] The description of circumcision as a baptism suggests, it will be observed, that Justin is using the term rather figuratively than literally, and the suggestion extends to the word "baptized." Nevertheless, considered in itself, the sentence is not necessarily impatient of the interpretation put upon it by Professor Oulton, and could be taken as evidence of belief that the gift of holy Spirit is an effect of water-baptism, additional to remission of sins and regeneration.[2] Yet, certainty is lacking, and to decide the interpretation one way or another we should require from Justin a fuller statement than the sentence itself contains. Fortunately, upon this point the *Dialogue* has something more to say.

In ch. xxxix, Justin animadverts upon the Jews' hardness of heart in rejecting God. Such wickedness, he contends, calls for divine punishment. Notwithstanding, he proceeds, God holds His hand, "because He knows that day by day some are becoming disciples to the name of His Christ, and are leaving the way of error, who also receive gifts individually, as they are worthy, being enlightened (*φωτιζόμενοι*) through the name of this Christ. For one receives a spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching and another of the fear of God." Trypho, ignoring the inaccuracy of the reference to Isa. xi, 2,[3] interjects that Justin is demented. Justin replies by applying to Christ

[1] The Greek of the passage is, *τίς οὖν ἔτι μοι περιτομῆς λόγος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ μαρτυρηθέντι; τίς ἐκείνου τοῦ βαπτίσματος χρεία ἁγίῳ πνεύματι βεβαπτισμένῳ;*

[2] It will be noticed that, although Justin is not silent on the subject of the spirit in the *Apology*, yet, had we been dependent upon that document, we should not have learned or inferred that the " washing " could be described as a " baptism with holy Spirit."

[3] It will be seen that Justin has conflated certain of the Pauline gifts of 1 Cor. xii, 8 *f.* with those of Isaiah, but has preserved the number seven.

the prophecy of Psalm lxviii, 18, "He went up on high, he took captive a company of captives, he gave gifts to men." The Christians are Christ's company of captives; and the ascended Christ is the source, to them, of the gifts or "spirits," which the Christians therefore not only possess, but, as Justin states subsequently in ch. lxxxviii, can be seen to possess.

It is in chs. lxxxvii-viii of the *Dialogue* that this part of the argument is eventually developed. Trypho takes up Isa. xi, 2, "the spirit of God shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, " etc., here correctly quoted, and asks, "You have admitted to me that these words were spoken of Christ; and you declare Him to be pre-existent God, and you declare that He was made flesh according to God's will and that through the virgin He was made man. How, then, can He be shown to be pre-existent, seeing that He is filled by the powers of the holy Spirit, which the Word enumerates by Isaiah, as if He stood in need of them ?" (ch. lxxxvii). Justin commends the good sense of this question, and proceeds to answer it at some length. The passage quoted, he contends, cannot properly be interpreted to mean that Christ stood in need of the Spirit's powers; by "resting," Scripture means that the powers of the Spirit are gathered into Christ at the Incarnation, and cease from operation among the Jews. Further, these same powers of Isa. xi, 2 must, according to prophecy, be given again by Christ to those who believe in Him, "as He knows each to be worthy"; and to Psalm lxviii, 18 Justin adds the prophecy of Joel ii, 28 *f.*, "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, and upon my servants and upon my handmaids, and they shall be prophets." Justin now reaches that stage of his argument which, for the purposes of this article, is of a striking significance and interest. Christ, he says, had His power, as soon as He was born, and "apportioned what was proper to each period of His growth" for some thirty years until John appeared as His herald. "And then," Justin continues, "when Jesus came to the river Jordan, where John was baptizing, and when Jesus went down into the water, fire was kindled in the Jordan; and the apostles of this same Christ of ours wrote that, when He came up from the water, the holy Spirit, as a dove, fell upon Him. And we know that it was not as having need of being baptized, or as having need of the Spirit that came upon Him in form of a dove, that He went to the river; just as it was not because He had need of being born and being crucified that He underwent these things. But it was for the sake (*ὑπέρ*) of the race of men, which, from the time of Adam, had fallen beneath death and the deceit of the serpent" (ch. lxxxviii).

Remote as Justin's ways of thinking are from our own, it is not impossible to follow the movement of his mind in these chapters. Christianity, as he and his fellow-believers understand it, is before all else the fulfilment, after long preparation, of a divine design unfolded in ancient Hebrew prophecy. At the centre of this prophecy is the promise that the powers of the holy Spirit, enumerated in Isa. xi, should be given to men and women by Him who alone can give them, because they are His alone to give—*i.e.*, by the Messiah or Christ. These powers can be given, of course, only to those who believe

in the Giver; and it is therefore of supreme importance that men should be able to identify the Giver. For this reason, God, who understands that it is not enough for men only to hear the prophecy proclaimed, also provides visible proof of its fulfilment. That Christ is the Giver of the powers of the Spirit is made plain to all by what occurred after Christ's baptism in Jordan. The powers of the Spirit themselves, also, as Justin enumerates them from Isa. xi, and as we hear of them in the Confirmation Prayer to-day, are the unique and special, the constitutive, possession and glory of Christ and the Christians; the Christians themselves, as Justin says, exhibit proof that the prophecy is being fulfilled, and that the powers of the Spirit are actually given, taken and possessed.

It can hardly be denied that the passages considered in this article form an important addendum to what may be learned about Christian initiation from Justin's *Apology*. In the *Apology*, it would seem, barely the half is told us; but to the Jew, who shares the Scriptures and many true beliefs with the Christian, more may properly be revealed. If the pagan asks, "What really makes a man a Christian?" Justin answers with a not too detailed account of water-baptism and its meaning, and is careful to avoid reference to the gospel narrative of Christ's baptism in the Jordan and of the miraculous event which followed.[1] If the Jew asks the question, Justin replies, "What really makes a man a Christian is the gift to him of the Spirit of God, which, promised to the Christ in Isa. xi, was seen to rest upon Jesus after He had received John's baptism in the Jordan and is now given to them who believe in Him." But, if so much may be revealed to the Jew, much must still be withheld. Trypho is nowhere allowed to ask, "If, then, possession of the Spirit makes a man a Christian, when and in what way is the Spirit given to him?" The answer to such a question could not be made in the *Dialogue*, or to any mere inquirer, however interested and sympathetic, but only to a catechumen tried and tested to the point of initiation. It must be a matter of regret to all students of early Christian belief and practice that Justin has not left us a work comparable with Tertullian's *De Baptismo*, in which the answer could be set out.

In spite of this, it may not be impossible, by reading between the lines of *Dialogue* lxxxviii, to hazard a guess at the answer which Justin would give. The guess which the present writer would make agrees with the general view rather of Dom Gregory Dix than of Professor Oulton. If we may take as a literal expression of his belief the statement that the Christ underwent His baptism and the descent of the Spirit "for the sake of the race of men," it will seem likely that, in Justin's eyes, the Gospel account of these events is the rationale of, and provides the pattern for, the Christian's initiation. Again, if we may take *au pied de la lettre* the distinction, which appears in Justin's own narrative

[1] It is not difficult to see why the *arcanum*, for Justin, was less concerned with the eucharistic institution narrative than with initiation. If the pagan reader were introduced to the account of Christ's baptism in Jordan as the ground of Christian initiation, he would have had a clue to the great "mystery of the Christians"—*i.e.*, the giving of the Spirit.

of the scene between the moment of Christ's baptism in the water and the moment of the descent of the Spirit, it will seem likely that Justin thinks of the Christian's reception of the Spirit as following, and not as accompanying, the "washing." In other words, the distinction which a later period recognizes in the terms "baptism" and "confirmation" is already present in Justin's thought, which, we may reasonably assume, was aligned with the practice of his day. On the other hand, the *Dialogue* gives not the slightest indication of what that practice was. *Pace* Professor Oulton, however, the *Apology* may supply a hint. The "common prayers," which after a "washing" the assembled brethren offer "for themselves, for him who has been enlightened and for all other (brethren) everywhere," belong, as is evident from the context, to the initiatory setting. To interpret them as a general intercession, such as would be appropriate to the regular Sunday assembly, is to do violence both to the sense of the context and to Justin's own account of the prayers. The common prayers of *Apology* lxv, as Justin clearly indicates (and, it may be added, as the pagan reader would again recognize as common form), are concerned with the meaning of initiation; their general tenor is petition for the graces of godliness and stability, that all who have been baptized may achieve the purpose of their baptism, viz., "eternal salvation." There is, then, nothing intrinsically improbable or impossible in the suggestion that the petitions "for him who has been enlightened" should have a particular reference to his own initiation, and should include some special supplication that holy Spirit, or the powers enumerated in Isa. xi, 2, should now be given to the new member, as they had been given to the rest. That Justin makes no clear statement to this effect need not be held to invalidate the suggestion, if the propositions put forward in this article are well founded. Certain it is that "baptism with holy Spirit" makes a man a Christian, one of "the brethren," and in this connexion Justin supplies us with a significant detail. The brethren exchange the kiss of brotherhood, he says, not as soon as the new member is brought into the assembly from the scene of his "washing," but "when we have come to the end of the prayers."[1] Upon this point Justin's statement admits of no question.

The mention of "baptism with holy Spirit" brings us back to the sentence quoted by Professor Oulton from *Dialogue* xxix. This article will have made it plain, so the present writer hopes, how, in the general context of the relevant passages of the *Dialogue*, he himself would interpret that sentence.[2] Unless he has totally misrepresented the

[1] *Cf.* the Bishop's kiss at the end of the Confirmation Prayer, and the kiss of peace after the prayers, in the Baptismal Rite of *Apostolic Tradition* (ed. Dix, p. 39). Note also the exclusion of the uninitiated from the kiss (*ibid.*, p. 29).

[2] Justin's phrase " baptized with holy Spirit " is an indirect quotation or reminiscence of a passage which he quotes in full in c. xlix. The passage occurs in the exposition of the temporary character of John the Baptist's mission. It is John's proclamation at the Jordan, and conflates (with variants) Matt. iii, 11, 12, with Luke iii, 16, 17, as follows: " I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance; but one mightier than I will come. . . . He will baptize you in holy Spirit and fire." Taken in isolation, this passage could be employed to argue that water-baptism was not a Christian usage in Justin's time !

relevant passages of both *Dialogue* and *Apology*, Justin's statements may be said to reveal enough of that pattern of Christian initiation, which becomes familiar to us in and after the time of Tertullian and Hippolytus, to make it appear improbable that Justin regarded water-baptism as the whole of Christian initiation.

E. C. Ratcliff.

Some Practical Difficulties of Reunion

The ordinary reader of the daily newspapers, and those many clergy and laity of the Church who depend on the newspapers for information even of ecclesiastical affairs, must be presuming that the Church of England is moving rapidly and contentedly towards some form of reunion with the "non-conformists." Those fewer clergy and laity who keep themselves informed through the official publications of the Church must likewise be aware that reunion is very much "in the air." There is scarcely a report published of any commission, whether it be "Towards the Conversion of England" or the "Theology of Christian Initiation," without the bearing of the subject on reunion being stated at some point. That all things be done decently and oecumenically seems to be an underlying theme of church policy. The Archbishop's sermon at Cambridge, the South India Church, the forthcoming gathering of the "World Council of Churches" and the hitherto clandestine Lambeth conversations all give the impression that the tempo is being steadily increased. What is the reaction of the Church in general to this policy? This article is an attempt to answer that question, and is therefore an essay in the difficult art of generalization. It is based on carefully collected information gathered from representative parishes all over England and sifted by a group of clergy in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

The attitude of the laity seems to present little difficulty. They have received very little instruction indeed on the issues involved and are on the whole apathetic to the solution of them. While not averse to the invitation of the non-conformist ministers (of the "recognized denominations" only) to the induction of the incumbent or to united services on "Remembrance Sunday" or Good Friday, they are on the whole not interested in schemes of reunion—mainly from lack of information, but partly from that dull conservatism which abhors all innovation. Such schemes as that suggested in these columns recently by the Rector of Wigan—of mutual study groups of laity for discussion of reunion problems—seem to be very rare. The impression is recorded from the laity of some parishes that, as the Methodist scheme of reunion has not achieved its object anywhere but on the notice-boards, the time is not ripe for further approaches.

The attitude of the clergy is more complex. There are, of course, those who have neither studied the issues involved nor care about their resolution. That sinister element obtrudes itself in every ecclesiastical problem. There is possibly a larger element who are prepared to follow the lead given by authority in all circumstances,

who in an honest and good heart believe that the matter is best left in the hands of the episcopate. Then there are the present-day successors of the Latitudinarians who, from convictions of what they call Christian charity and from the instinct of good neighbourliness, welcome co-operation to the extent of eventual reunion and abhor the alternative of continued separation; they would be prepared to pay almost any price to avoid the continuance of this scandal. These categories between them may represent more than half of the clergy of the Church. But it seems fairly certain that a large majority even of them have no confidence in the Archbishop's scheme of full communion as a means to the end they desire. The writer, making inquiries on this question radially outwards from his parish, recorded twenty-one "Noes" before the first "Aye." Of those clergy who are articulate on the general question of reunion there seems to be a minority, and that at each extreme, of those who are as yet firmly decided upon the right course. They have come to their conclusions, almost without exception, on the doctrines of the Church and of Holy Orders. There is, however, a large proportion of the articulates who seem to be uneasy on practical rather than doctrinal grounds. The rest of this article is an attempt to tabulate the difficulties of these clergymen. They deserve the most careful study.

1. There is widespread anxiety whether this whole question has had fair discussion in the councils of the Church. The ordinary machinery of church government as it is at present is not well suited to the handling of such a large problem as this, in which it is essential that the opinion of the clergy in the parishes be adequately explored; for in the long run it is they who will have to work or sabotage any scheme that may be proposed. As long as there are state appointments to the higher offices of the Church (and therefore by derivation also to the subsidiary offices) the Assemblies and Convocations of the Church do not necessarily always speak her mind. At a time when the "oecumenical" outlook seems to be the *sine qua non* qualification for appointment to a Bishopric this suspicion must naturally flourish. Although probably none of the clergy who nourish this suspicion would wish to substitute presbyterian majority government for episcopacy, yet they feel that when larger issues of this kind are at stake the state-appointed hierarchy should take care that their policy is widely debated by free assemblies of the Church (Synods and Diocesan Conferences) before proposed lines of policy are announced in the press. There is a belief that, after free discussion, many of those who are now inarticulate would show themselves to be on the side of caution rather than of precipitate action. There can be no doubt that, in the opinion of many, episcopal and official enthusiasm has outrun the possible limits of presbyteral co-operation. This situation is unhealthy and must breed more suspicion until it is brought out into the open. It is impossible to ignore, further, the continual hints of Proctors in Convocation that a free discussion of these issues is unwelcome in the Assembly and Convocations. The view is also expressed in several cases that the personnel of the Archbishop's Lambeth advisers do not adequately represent the mind of the parish

priests who will have to do the job. It is worthy of mention that these misgivings are registered by "evangelicals" as well as by high orthodox churchmen, for they are more than any suspicious of the possible effects of an ecclesiastical "job."

2. The Establishment itself, with the attendant circumstances of private and party patronage and parliamentary control of Prayer-Book reform, presents a problem for the reunion enthusiasts which, it is suspected, has had far too little attention. For whatever may be the domestic attitude of the Church of England towards these problems, the non-conformist denominations must surely have something trenchant to say about them. If it is true that the "sister churches" are to bring into the parent body "the riches of their own particular traditions" they will surely require that these problems be tackled squarely before they join us. How can the descendants of the English dissenters, if they are true to their heritage, want union with a church in which, *e.g.*, the guilty co-respondent in a divorce suit and a notorious unbeliever have the disposal of cures of souls, *while these abuses remain unreformed?* The Baptists—more honour to them—have stated their position clearly with regard to the government appointment of dignitaries. Dr M. E. Aubrey, addressing the Baptist Conference of 1945, is reported to have said: "We must state plainly that we cannot consider reunion with the Established Church as long as she allows her chief officers, whether they be Archbishops or Bishops or Deans, to be appointed by the civil power." The non-conformists should all be quite adamant about this. The fact that some of them seem willing to continue negotiations, without making this a pre-condition, lays the sincerity of their aims open to suspicion. From the Anglican side it should be noted that, broadly speaking, those prelates and clergy who are in the van in matters of reunion are not proportionately enthusiastic about the reform of those abuses which reunion should entail. If the whole desire behind reunion were to present "a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing" the advocates of reunion would also be the most active enemies of every form of Erastian corruption. That is not generally the case.

3. The most serious misgivings of all seem to be on the question of church membership. The discipline of the laity in the Church of England is practically dead. The only regulation of any kind that is accepted or enforced is that Confirmation is required as a test of communicant membership. The fact that good order exists there is an indication not so much of discipline as of apathy towards the sacrament. Baptism, matrimony and the rite of Christian burial are dispensed indiscriminately without regard to any known form of Christian response, and often without preparation. The natural result is that a large proportion of the population of the country is under the impression that they are adequate Christians and that the Church has nothing to ask of them. A Ministry, in so far as that involves binding and loosing, does not exist. Most of the non-conformists concur in this indiscipline, and, on grounds of Christian charity so called, would be against refusing anybody anything. The Baptists alone bear witness and guard the sacrament of Baptism most carefully. There is, however,

in the Church of England a healthy uneasiness that this state of affairs is unsatisfactory. Debates in the Assembly, particularly on Canon Law reform, and the existence of a Baptism Reform Movement, show that the conscience of the Church is slowly revolting against this anarchical abandonment of the order of the Prayer Book. Catholic and Evangelical join in condemning what is a travesty of the ministry of both word and sacrament. But what contribution have the non-conformist bodies to make to the resolution of this conflict? With them the difficulties are more severe. The origins of English dissent have at least this element in common: the dissenters revolted against the conception that every citizen as such should be regarded as a member of the Church and in the way to salvation. Where the established Church was corrupt because too inclusive and distended, they went into the wilderness to enjoy the private fellowship of a gathered church of believers only. They abandoned anarchy for discipline; they preferred conversion to citizenship as a test of Christian membership. But the present descendants of those noble reformers have so far lost the fire of that original inspiration as to have embraced its opposite extreme. Communion is offered without reserve; infant Baptism is offered without conscious response, often without godparents at all; the flattery of Christian burial is open to all, with no questions asked. Attendance at, or even a subscription to, the "Anniversary" or the annual "Messiah" is allowed to stand equivalent to the regular following of the Christian life. The natural result of this anarchy is that the non-conformist bodies are hopelessly amorphous, and distended beyond recognition. How can membership of the Church, still less the sacraments, be offered under such conditions? The suspicion exists that, unless these difficulties are faced squarely, all the best reforming zeal in the Church of England will be undercut. Those conscientious priests who require instruction interviews for godparents as a preliminary to infant Baptism know from experience that all too many "churchmen" prefer to take their children to the neighbouring Methodist chapel where no such requirements are made. That difficulty will not be resolved if the Methodist Chapel notice-board reads "Church of England—Methodist." Under this heading also it can be said that those who are most insistent on the benefits of reunion from the Church of England side are often the least interested in the domestic reforms which these abuses require.

4. The administration of the sacraments and terms of membership among the non-conformists are not such as to convince men of sin, but rather such as to administer an anodyne against the pains of possible repentance. Similarly, it is asserted that the ministry of the word among them is, in general, concerned rather with comforting and flattering than with rebuking or even challenging. That accusation can also be laid at the doors of many vicarages and rectories, but there are at least within the established Church not a few prophets who dare to lift the voice. It is objected that the freedom of the "free" churches lays them open to additional abuses which the liturgy of the Prayer Book makes impossible in the Church. It may be possible to reach agreement on all the main doctrinal issues with the scholars

of non-conformity, but how far are the doctrines of the ancient faith really preached from the provincial pulpits? We may make agreement on our teachings about the state of the departed and about the Judgment, but what is actually offered at a non-conformist funeral as the ministry of the word? Those who have experience of these things (ex-ministers in Anglican orders are enlightening) tend to say that in this instance consolation and the comforts of the Resurrection are too often offered to the exclusion of any mention of penitence, absolution and the Judgment. Those who have listened carefully to "united" Armistice sermons or Army Padres' hours tend to agree that the same effete strain is to be found there, many more times emphasized than in the Church of England at its worst. If it were true that reunion would bring back into the Church the vivid prophecy of the Dissenters or the fire of conversion, there would be much to be said for it on that score. It will seem to some that such criticism of the ministry of non-conformists is unwarranted and unjust. But it must be remembered that advocates of reunion have attempted to "sell" the idea on these grounds among others, and so to have started the argument. A recent Presidential Address at a diocesan conference contained the words: "The Church of England cannot face the future with any hope of success until she has incorporated within her fellowship the prophetic inspiration of the sister churches." In this objective inquiry into the reactions of the Church to these suggestions the existence of a contrary opinion must at least be recorded.

5. Almost no consideration seems to have been given to the fact that non-conformity in many parts of England is at least moribund. Large crowds may sometimes assemble to enjoy the annual "Messiah" or to hear the preacher on "Single Ladies' Sunday," but the normal adult assembly for regular Sunday worship is in many parts hopelessly small. Here again the experience of the provincial priest might well be called in to supplement the judgment of those who know only what happens at "spot" London chapels or in the academic centres. A group of investigators in a certain populous area of Yorkshire recorded the existence of 72 chapels in their survey whose average Sunday morning congregation was less than twelve members; there are few, if any, parish churches in the same area which are so consistently dead. The question is raised whether it is wise to propose to yoke the Church of England on equal terms with bodies whose life is almost extinct. It looks as though, on these grounds, the Church should demand, as a preliminary condition of reunion, the concentration of congregations and the sequestration or closure of redundant places of worship.

6. Children's work in the Church of England has been wondrously reformed in the past few decades. In most places there is at least an intention to relate the Sunday School closely to adult membership and to worship. In non-conformist Sunday Schools this is notoriously not the case, and, though exceptions may be quoted to the contrary, the non-conformist Sunday School stands, and is content to stand, where the Church Sunday School stood fifty years ago. The parish priests who discover church-baptized children attending the non-conformist Sunday School know that in practice there is little or no chance of their

attaining adult membership of any Christian body, and have to try to win them back while there is still a chance. This situation would not be changed by any scheme of reunion, except for the worse. "To bring them up in the fear and nurture of the Lord . . . and to receive the Holy Communion" would then be extended to cover possible attendance at a Church of England (Methodist) Sunday School, with little hope of success. Reunion here again would undercut all that is best in the reforming zeal of the Church of England, and St Christopher's College might well close its doors.

7. The non-conformist bodies who are most alive, and even advancing, in England, are precisely those who will stand outside any schemes of reunion. Those are the Roman Catholics, the Baptists and the various descriptions of Pentecostal missions. It seems strange that we should strive to ally ourselves to all that is weak (and deservedly weak) outside the Church while making little attempt to recapture zeal, either by fellowship or by precept, from those who in this generation are most blessed with it.

All these awkward considerations, and many more, exercise many of the men who have to fulfil their ministry in the parishes. It would at least be helpful if large-scale statistics and a wholesale survey of evidence could be compiled either to reinforce or to refute the generalizations ventured here. The hard fact is that these opinions are held, and held widely, by men whose ultimate sympathies lie with the friends of reunion. That present anxiety should not be allowed to continue unrelieved. It is based on the fear that there is a broadening cleavage between the official hierarchy and the parish clergy (or a not inconsiderable section of them) on a question of great importance. It is one thing for our Archbishop and his advisers to come to terms on doctrinal issues with Dodd, Whale, Manson, Farmer and such eminent men. But it is felt to be quite another thing for the parish priest in the provinces to contemplate amalgamation with his local ministers and their amorphous bodies of adherents. These local difficulties should be aired widely and discussed now, lest the cause of reunion be set back by the failure of precipitate action. If it were a matter of welcoming back into the Church the genius of dissent that was forced out of it by church maladministration, that policy would command a great deal of support. But that distinctive genius is dead, and no reunion parleys can revive it. Those who most deplore the divisions of Christendom can look back wistfully to the prime days of Dissent in England, whose genius was the gathered church, whose technique conversion, and whose prophecy was very fire. With that outpouring of the Spirit, if it were still flowing, all would be proud to be associated. But if it is a matter of receiving into the Church the churchmanship of the "Anniversary" or the annual "Messiah," or the prophecies of the "Wayside Pulpit," their present descendants, there are many priests who are not so sure.

There may be many of the clergy who would be willing to let the question of reunion drift on its own way to any conclusion which "the authorities" may see fit to devise. But in fairness it must be stated that there is a strong body of dissentients, and it is asserted here that the

majority of such dissentients stand aside for practical rather than for doctrinal reasons, the strongest of which are tabulated above. All negotiators and enthusiasts, therefore, must face the fact that any attempt to force the pace in this matter will just drive a wedge straight through the heart of the Church of England. There is therefore a difference in kind between the difficulties of the unionists of South India or those who seek to unite the Church of England to continental protestantism, and of those who seek pan-protestantism at home in England. For in this last case, there is the difficulty widely felt that English non-conformity is not in practice in a state to enter into any form of union, and that the established Church is so weakened and distorted by the lack of overdue reforms and so crippled by the effects of chronic state control that she should in fairness put her own house in order before making further proposals of matrimony. It is one thing for two vigorous youngsters, as in South India is the case, to make an alliance. It is much more difficult for their rheumatic elders to bring about a betrothal. What these clergymen referred to above are saying is that, though it may be quite proper for the old folks to write to one another even now, they might wait until they are both out of hospital and convalescent before betrothal takes place. It is to be hoped that all points of view will be fully represented in the Lambeth conversations. It is not enough that "liberals" and "high orthodox" should sit and discuss the questions of the Church and of Holy Orders or the faith in general; there is so much to be said by the practical men which makes their deliberations premature.

BERNARD PAWLEY.

Charles Williams—II. The City and the Substitutions

THE image of the City in the writings of Charles Williams means more than the visible or the invisible Church. It is also the Empire and the Republic, the ordered community of civilization, and the tradition and discipline of art and letters, as these coinhere in a living organism. In the two Amen House Masques, written for private theatricals in 1927 and 1929, the City is the Oxford University Press, in its sense of spiritual responsibility, of regular rule, of a great tradition to be handed down. Sir Humphrey Milford is Cæsar. In *Taliessin*, on the other hand, the primary image is the Byzantine empire. At some time between 1927 and 1928, Byzantium seems to have replaced Rome as an image of order in Charles Williams's mind. This may be due to the discovery, perhaps in Robert Byron's *The Byzantine Achievement*, of the mystery surrounding the throne of Solomon, seen in a vision by Chloe Burnett in *Many Dimensions* (1931). In 1932-33, reports on the mosaics of Saint Sophia passed through his hands at the press, and deepened his understanding of Byzantine imagery. I do not think that a special knowledge of the history is of much use to the reader of the poems as poems. The important thing to remember is that in the Byzantine empire the state was in the Church and the Church in the state, and the tradition of learning and iconographic

design in both. It is misleading to call the Byzantine church a state department. It would be truer to say that the empire was a theocracy where an error in doctrine or ritual, even in ecclesiastical art, might easily produce a political revolution. The higher clergy were celibate; the parish clergy were compelled to marry. A like polarity divided the army from the secular bureaucracy, where the proportion of eunuchs in the sacred palace, however painful their plight, at least emphasized the variety of functions in human vocation and density:

> The organic body sang together;
> The Acts of Identity adored their Lord;
> The song sprang and rang in Byzantium.
> O you shoulders, elbows, wrists,
> bless him, praise him, magnify him for ever;
> you fittings of thumbs and fingers,
> bless ye the Lord;
> sockets and balls in knees and ankles,
> bless ye the Lord;
> hips, thighs, spine in its multiples,
> bless him, praise him, magnify him for ever.

In the poetry of Charles Williams, as at the court of Byzantium, the Emperor is an image of God, but he is also head of his body the empire, the representative man. It is misleading to transpose myth into allegory, as Mr C. S. Lewis has done in an article on *Taliessin* in *The Oxford Magazine*,[1] where he says, "The Emperor has made nothing but good. . . . The Emperor symbolizes God." Here and there such a treatment may be justified, but even in such a line as "These were the shapes only the Emperor knew" more is intended than "only God knows." The symbol is nearer to *Christos Pantokrator* in the dome of a Byzantine basilica, humanity hypostatized and taken up into God. To Charles Williams it was a fundamental Christian doctrine that all the members of Christ's body suffer together, and that each of them can suffer for another. We bear each other's burdens, carry each other's parcels; we can receive the full impact of fear, regret, remorse, even sin, not only for those we know and love, but for others who may have passed long ago into another state of being, and for the unborn who are yet to be. We may do this wittingly or unwittingly, but we cannot avoid the implication of all our lives in one another's life,

> " dying each other's life, living each other's death."

Perhaps the simplest introduction to this idea is in that strange novel, *Descent into Hell*, where Peter Stanhope, a most attractive self-portrait, endures the sensitiveness of Pauline, who in her turn bears the fear of the Marian martyr who was her ancestor and of a labourer who has hanged himself in the building of her town. The fullest poetic expression of the image of substitution is in *Taliessin* and *The Region of the Summer Stars* (1944), where the theme is the exchange between three ways of living and loving; in marriage, represented by Bors and Elayne; virginity, represented by the Princess Dindrane; and

[1] March 14th, 1946.

that third romantic relationship, represented in the loves of Taliessin and Dindrane, who is Blanchefleur, the sister of Percival. The union of these three ways is made physically real in the birth of Galahad, whose mother was a dedicated virgin, Helayne. His father, Lancelot, the loyal lover of Queen Guenevere, met Helayne in a magical substitution where his eyes and hers were alike sealed, and the fruit of this marriage was the High Prince.

All the substitutions are in Christ, who died for all, in whom all died. This is brought home dramatically in the radio play, *The Three Temptations*, adapted in 1942 from an earlier passion play, where Pilate's wife suffers "many things this day in a dream because of Him";

> He came to my bed and did not say a word,
> but his face became the face of each of my friends,
> each in turn, each pale, each in its agony,
> each staring at me. I knew their pains,
> the separate secret stubborn pains of each,
> and yet it was no-one all the time but he.
> Their pains were in his body, and I too—
> Husband, I too, I in Him—
> I felt my muscles cramp, my bones burn,
> my head rack as if thorns stabbed.
> Their pains in his, his in mine;
> he stood, and his face changed and never changed—
> he was each and all and none. I was his slave,
> his thing, his nothing. O I have suffered terrors
> this hour because of him. My dear Lord,
> do not speak to him, do not look at him, let him go.

Some of the most moving substitutions are in *All Hallows' Eve*, where there is exchange between the living and the early dead. Here and in *The Summer Stars* I find a new lucidity, which it is not easy to prove by quotation. The proof is in the more difficult passages, which out of their context remain impenetrable. The change might be defined as a movement from the ode into narrative, from *Lycidas* into something that bears a corresponding relation to *Paradise Lost*. In *Taliessin through Logres* even a battle is lyrical:

> Bors flung his company forward; the horse and the reserve
> caught the sea's host in a double curve;
> the paps of the day were golden-girdled;
> hair, bleached white by the mere stress of the glory,
> drew the battle through the air up threads of light.
> The tor of Badon heard the analytical word;
> the grand art mastered the thudding hammer of Thor,
> and the heart of our lord Taliessin determined the war.

Here everything is translated into melody, into Taliessin's own music, seen from the point of view of "the king's poet." In *The Summer Stars*, on the other hand, only *The Meditation of Mordred* is broken up into stanzas. Where the movement is lyrical the surface is narrative, as in *The Departure of Dindrane*,

> everywhere centaurs round her on the road, the bush
> of hazels everywhere, all rose in the rush

> of the company of the household changing to centaur shapes
> ranging among the hazels: centaur or hazel
> she ? slave or free ? no centaur, that
> for eyes other, if ever—of a child, of a lover,
> of the First Mover, of adoration, of a joined future
> that should see her new-personal as the king's poet impersonal
> had seen her and stated to God—her single future
> now her own statement, her statement her function.

This second change in style might be in part explained by the influence of dramatic work. It is true that the plays grow easier to act. *The House by the Stable* and *Grab and Grace* have a very high entertainment value. *The House of the Octopus* shows the most obvious signs of an attempt to meet the needs of a producer by writing in words of one syllable. But it seems to me that it suffers as poetry from too deliberate an attempt at immediate communication to as many people as possible, and that this itself defeats its own end. The matter may also be complicated by the transition from the Accuser, an image of negation who gradually reveals his positive function, to the Flame, a figure of light with a dark back.

The lucidity of *All Hallows' Eve* and the comparative lucidity, at least, of *The Summer Stars* seems to me more closely associated with the change from London to Oxford at the beginning of the war. Charles Williams ceased to be seer in the congregation or in a gathering of ardent souls eager for adult education, or for the progress of religious drama. I do not want to disparage this earlier audience. On the contrary I believe that Charles Williams was right, and some years ahead of everyone else, in his realization of the significance for culture of the ardour of students in classes for adult education at the City Literary Institute. But when he met a similar ardour armed with the weapons of information, candid criticism must have sharpened the weapons of communication. This he did find in Oxford, not only among his contemporaries, but among some of the students who tramped through any amount of wind and weather to listen to an interpretation of *Comus*, imperfectly understood and impossible to miss.

The world's interests were moving towards his, not only in Oxford but elsewhere. The translations of Kierkegaard that the Oxford Press published at his instigation during the difficult years of the war very soon vanished from the book shops. *The Descent of the Dove* (1939), his own interpretation of church history, written, as has been said, "from the point of view of the Holy Ghost," was the first of his books to win an immediate success. Auden read it in America, as we know not only from a note in *New Year Letter*, but from much else in the poem. Soon it came into the hands of Sidney Keyes, who walked the streets of Oxford murmuring speeches out of *Cranmer*, not knowing that Charles Williams was living in the same town and walking the same ways.

In *The Descent of the Dove* he spoke of "the reconciliation between the Church and the ordinary process of things" that began before the conversion of Constantine:

It would not be true to say that the Church consented to have her extraordinary supernatural graces driven underground; it would be truer to say that she made preparations for drawing into herself the whole of human existence.

In his mind the marriage of the Church and Empire was a great romantic experiment, represented in the embrace of Constantius with Helena, the mother of Constantine, in *Judgement at Chelmsford*,

> our two hearts
> making a future from this quality of greatness
> shall strew time with a fresh order of perfection,
> a holy wisdom, sprung from Colchester and Rome,
> redeemed flesh blazing with primordial glory—

It might be that this experiment was about to be repeated. Christendom had suffered the "quality of disbelief" in Montaigne, an historical image of the Accuser; and "the return of the manhood" in the French and Russian revolutions. In Kierkegaard, who "caused alien and opposite experiences to coinhere," "the way of the Affirmation of images had returned." His progress was beyond the æsthetic, the philosophical, the ethical, even the religious, to something more. These things were part of the action of the city, every whit as much as the rise of scholasticism or the building of the cathedrals. They were preparation for new experience, for the parousia, the second coming. To Charles Williams the second coming was certainly not

> Some far off divine event
> To which the whole creation moves

by a development, by process and progress. If he heard the expression "realized eschatology," it was at the very end of his life; but he had the idea at the very beginning of his poetry, where falling in love is eschatological experience.

I want to insist for a moment on the literal meaning of this. Dante's Beatrice was a Florentine girl with a gay smile. She was also an eternal mystery, more than a mere allegorical figure of Wisdom or of the Celestial Church. In *The Figure of Beatrice* (1942), as contrasted with the earlier chapters on "the theology of romantic love" in *He came down from Heaven* (1936), the scope of the experience is wider. If Beatrice is Wisdom, Florence is Heaven; the long and complicated digressions into Florentine politics in the *Paradiso* are not, after all, padding. They are there to indicate a correspondence between the earthly and the heavenly City. In the context of this developing interest in polity rather than in politics, in equality and hierarchy, the Republic and the Empire, we have to see the new zest for the understanding of his own time that grew upon Charles Williams in the last ten years of his life. It began before he came to Oxford. The starting-points were in *Cranmer* and *Seed of Adam*, where he stepped outside the small circle of his earlier friendships. His mind and his style were always growing to the very end.

At the end of his life he was no longer "eccentric to contemporary writing." Sidney Keyes wrote in a letter quoted by Michael Meyer in the introduction to his *Collected Poems*:

the only living writers whom I can accept entirely are Eliot, Charles Williams, Graves (in part), my great friend John Heath-Stubbs . . . and a few others, very few.

The collocation is significant. Despite immense differences in method, Eliot and Charles Williams are at one not only in their religious conclusions, but in their occupation with "the matter of Britain," the wasted land and the wounded fisher-king, the Grail and the chapel perilous, "only the wind's home." The same counterpoint of the Affirmations and the Negations is in *Murder in the Cathedral*, *Cranmer of Canterbury*, and *Judgement at Chelmsford*.

Eliot is the more perfect poet, but the perfection of his choice of words is apt to inhibit response to our own experience. His influence can reduce younger writers to silence or sterility. We need a style and standards that will allow for the Miltonic poet who writes his time to his own music, as well as the Shakespearean who makes music from the conversation of the streets. Charles Williams has been uniquely valuable as a reminder of possibilities seldom realized in modern times. If his thought never found its perfect form in art, it was essentially poetic thinking, an act of myth-making, and that is itself an artistic achievement. Where his myth is transcribed into allegory it loses the double edge of ambiguity, as in some of the novels of Mr C. S. Lewis, influenced by his matter and his manner. Where, on the other hand, the two streams meet of Eliot's influence and his own, as in the poetry of Sidney Keyes and John Heath-Stubbs, Anne Ridler and Norman Nicholson, fresh myth-making activities become possible in a style that is not simply derivative from either, but stands secure in its own right.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

(*Concluded*)

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. E. C. Ratcliff is Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

The Rev. B. Pawley is Rector of Elland, Yorkshire.

Brother George Every is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

CORRESPONDENCE

PRAYER BOOK REVISION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In the second part of his extended survey of prospects for Prayer Book Revision Dr Oscar Hardman asserts that the Prayer Book version of the Psalter is "very much out of favour," a "strain upon Christian devotion," "not made for the purpose of chanting,"

"a stumbling-block even to choirs." He proposes "a thorough revision of Coverdale's version, adapting it to liturgical use by correcting errors, removing obscurities and maledictions, rearranging verses with an eye to the requirements of the Anglican chant." But it seems strange that the cloth of the sixteenth century, the classical age of English poetry and prose, should be cut to suit the requirements of the Gothic revival, not in the Victorian age but in the twentieth century. It may well be that the Augustan age preferred Tate and Brady to the Great Bible, as the nineteenth century on the whole preferred what Dr Hardman calls "true hymnody" to the "doggerel" of the metrical psalms. But through all these changes of taste the translation made by Tyndale, and revised by Coverdale and his collaborators for the Great Bible, has continued to move men, nor has it been displaced by later and more "correct" translations in any province of the Anglican communion where the English language is used in worship.

I think the reason is that it was made while English was still a language of poetry rather than of prose, and of popular homespun poetry, redolent of the street and of the farmyard. By the reign of James the First the intellectual resources of the language were greater, and the divines were far more ready with theological interpretations already handled in English sermons. In the middle of the sixteenth century it was easier to discover the concrete image, a word or phrase full of life and colour ("grin like a dog and run about the city"). The meaning might be obscure, but that could be discovered in meditation.

At no time has this version of the Psalter ceased to be an influence on English poetry. I would hazard a guess that it has been more influential in the last twenty years than in any comparable period, more in tune with the prevailing manner and mood. "A . . . tendency on the part of the clergy to reduce the element of psalmody to small proportions" is a hangover from a bad period, and an offence to those who are often perplexed by the indifference of the Anglican clergy to the quality of their ecclesiastical literature and architecture.

Yours, etc.,

House of the Sacred Mission, Kelham.

George Every, S.S.M.

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Is not Dr Hardman's "Second Principle of Prayer Book Revision" somewhat retrograde? One would wish for uniformity as to intention to worship God, in spirit and in truth, but is any good purpose served by uniformity of rite? It seems to me as a parish priest that what is wanted is an instructed laity, able to use any rite and understand its underlying emphasis. Dr Hardman seems to be thinking in terms of an established Church which must use a chain of worship adapted to its weakest link.

If there is a norm of worship, it must surely be the fullest rite possible, and all others would be truncated or defective versions of it.

The greatest sin is pride, and it is never more clearly exhibited than when the bigoted and narrow-minded interfere with the worship of God in the name of uniformity. Has the London diocese ever known a greater uniformity of spirit, or developed a wider charity than under Winnington-Ingram? Yet every variety of rite was enjoyed in the diocese under his episcopate, and he could go happily from a North End early celebration to a pontifical High Mass.

Yours sincerely,

CLAXBY RECTORY, LINCOLN.
February 10.

AUSTIN LEE.

BOOK REVIEWS

EPISCOPAL ACTS RELATING TO WELSH DIOCESES, 1066-1272. Volume I. Edited by James Conway Davies for the Historical Society of the Church in Wales. No. 1. 1946. To members. 10s.

An Englishman living but six miles across the border cannot review the first publication of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales without doing honour to himself and a probable injustice to his book. Yet he may praise more generously than the home-born, as praising another's work and not his own; and he may more properly commend this work from Wales to English churchmen and historians, as important for their own studies. For since its conquest by Henry I the Welsh Church has been bound to England by bands she cannot, if she would, shake off. The severance of 1920 could not dislodge them, nor was England then relieved of a responsibility which was hers for a problem largely of her making. The Church in Wales to-day, as she speaks with a double tongue, thinks with a double mind; there are two elements in her life which, try as she will, she cannot yet reconcile. Her ministry is almost wholly and self-consciously Welsh; her Prayer Book, whether in English or in Welsh translation, is the English 1662, taken over *verbatim* and not as yet officially revised. Her people are English or Anglicized down the marches and where there is money or holiday resorts, Welsh in the great central block and the ancient strongholds of the west. To the majority of Welshmen the Episcopal Church is still an outpost of Englishry, a relic of the Norman domination; the many pass it by and make nonconformity their refuge; some resent it fiercely; others, who love it because it is the Church of the Lord as well as of the Wales they love, grieve and chafe, and yet fulfil their ministry faithfully. It is an even question whether or not the nationalist movement will leave the Welsh Church untouched, to the detriment of both. A recent visitor to the border country from the west, having a cultivated English voice himself, was heard to address in Welsh the omnibus conductor, and then to curse his English ignorance in the same; and meanwhile the principal services in the Welsh cathedrals, which ought to be the shrines of native Christianity, continue unruffled in the English tradition.

England apart, there are contradictions here to baffle the inquiring visitor. The Church in Wales has a paper liberty and constitution envied of many in the established Church of England; after her spoliation she pooled what was left to her with apostolic open-handedness, graded her stipends, and in one reasoned plan interlocked patronage and economy. The fight against disestablishment and disendowment kindled a fire which burned in her for a decade or so and shone attractively across the border. It is not only the incessant fight with poverty that has dulled that fire; it is the very neatness, the rational completeness so intellectually satisfying, of the plan and constitution which, with the loss to nonconformity of the keenest nationals, has dispirited the clergy here. You are embarrassed by your variety in the Church of England; here we are simply dull. That is one side: poverty, worse than England knows (yet fought without allies from the past), and strangulation by routine; a numerically dwindling church (according to recent reports) in a nation losing its church- and chapel-going habits wherever exercised. On the other side there is an intellectual vigour swelling from a source somewhere we cannot see. The National Library of Wales publishes a *Journal* which one may shelve beside *John Rylands Bulletin* without incongruity; a Welsh archbishop has produced as a setting for the Welsh Church Constitution a manual of canon law better than any modern manual we have seen[1]; many congregations use a *Church People's Prayer Book*, which deals more adequately with the 1662 material than even the recent *Prayer Book Shortened*. The province gives its youth a quarterly magazine, *Cymry'r Groes*,[2] which youth councils everywhere might profitably study; its governing body puts out its budgets, reports and plans with admirable clarity, telling church people the facts and their corollaries. And now it has its own Historical Society, whose first publication should elevate it at once to the position of the Lincoln Record and the Canterbury & York Societies in the Church of England.

Can this new Society minister to the condition of the Church in Wales as we have tried to describe it? Can it help towards unity with catholicity, towards a national church in which there is no more cleavage into church and chapels multitudinous, and in which the national renascence can be redeemed and emerge as a creative, spiritual, Godward force? We believe that, with certain conditions, it can. The first condition, the highest tradition of accurate scholarship, is satisfied by this first publication: Mr Conway Davies has opened well. The second requires work of a different sort, and over a wider field; the Society must be extended from the high academic level to the parochial; there must be local groups all over Wales, meeting regularly to study and to discuss Welsh Church history in its widest application; these must be fed from above by the academicals, but led imaginatively by local mediators, parish priests and laymen. The organization of the Historical Association is proof enough that this extension need not lower standards. This work, if begun now,

[1] C. A. H. Green, *The Setting of the Constitution of the Church in Wales*, Sweet and Maxwell, 1937.

[2] Quarterly, 1s. 6d., from 150, St Helen's Road, Swansea.

would incidentally relieve the Society of financial danger; but it would do more in time. The third condition is that its membership, like its study, must be of the Church in Wales *in its widest application*: Nonconformity has a history, and that is church history too. Free Church ministers and congregations must be brought within the Society to work and study with it. Fourthly, the Church and the learned in England must bear their part in it; we here are a third province with Canterbury and York, with traditions older than either; we are autonomous, so far as catholicity allows us; yet there is no doom worse for us than isolation. And England has still some duty to us, and perhaps something yet to learn.

The present volume, of 413 pages, is the first of two which will provide a calendar of the principal documents so far known relating to episcopal acts and activities in the four ancient dioceses from 1066 to 1272, the period of the Normanization of the Church in Wales and its complete incorporation into the administrative system of the west. The documents for St David's alone are completed here; they are extracted from all the sources known to us for the period before the Episcopal Registers, which do not appear until 1397 and are very incomplete afterwards. Charters, attestations, letters close and patent, commissions ecclesiastical and royal, and grants of lands, portions, advowsons and the like, make up the bulk of the collection, clearly arranged in chronological order through successive episcopates. There are also rich extracts from the papal registers and from the magnificent archdeacon Giraldus, covering the claim to metropolitan status for St David's and Gerald's election to its throne. Most documents are from printed sources like the *Rolls Series*, the Stationery Office calendars, and printed histories, chartularies and registers; some are from MS; but the calendaring in all is exemplary—lucid, terse where brevity is required, ample and flowing where a narrative is to be sustained. The numbering is a model of simplicity; the printing is clear, and the text, but for one observed misprint (p. 67, n. 354), is faultless. The object of the collection is, of course, to assemble materials for a definitive history of the Church in Wales, and a sketch of the frame of this Mr Conway Davies has essayed in his long introduction. After two chapters upon the documents, their whereabouts, their history and quality (and in particular the *Book of Llan Dav* is examined) he passes to a study of the pre-Norman organization of the Church—monastic rather than diocesan, unparochial, isolated from Canterbury and Rome, and a law therefore unto itself. Bishops, after election by the princes, clergy and people of the local *clas*, were consecrated by their own predecessors. Then come the changes. The conquest of the Church was a political and military expedient. The establishment of a diocesan bishopric at St Asaph, 1143, and the transformation of the bishopric of the church of St Deiniol into the see of the diocese of Bangor in 1092; the probable conversion of a bishopric of Glamorgan into a see of Llandaff with Bishop Urban before 1119, and the forcing of a royal clerk, the Queen's chancellor, on the *clas* of St David's in 1115, were incidents respectively in two campaigns to conquer and to hold the north and the south. The metropolitan authority of Canter-

bury was clamped down upon the new administration, and not even Gerald's persuasiveness with Innocent III could get it taken off. Bernard's first revolt against Canterbury was well timed with Henry of Winchester's plan to carve out for his see a province of the south-west: an England and Wales with four provinces, and a fifth in Scotland, was a not unlikely pattern, and is one with possibilities still. New archdeaconries, rural deaneries and parishes followed in the newly defined dioceses, but the canonical discipline their consistories were expected to impose never overcame the Welsh family and hereditary system. An understanding of this puts Gascoigne's unsavoury gossip in a new light. English readers will find parts of this introduction heavy work, especially if they have no detailed historical map of Wales; but the editor has done his work so well that the main currents emerge clearly through their contributory detail; and these no church historian can afford to neglect. Application for membership of the Society should be made to its Honorary Secretary, 39, Cathedral Road, Cardiff.

G. R. Dunstan.
Hawarden.

The Ministry of the Church: A review by various authors (J. P. Hickinbotham, C. F. D. Moule, S. L. Greenslade, F. W. Dillistone, F. J. Taylor) of a book entitled *The Apostolic Ministry*, reprinted from "The Record," with corrections and a preliminary chapter by Bishop Stephen Neill. Canterbury Press. 2s.

The primary question which must be asked of this volume by one who was concerned with *The Apostolic Ministry* from its inception is: How far does it advance the discussion which our book inaugurated? What is its contribution to the Catholic-Protestant controversy? The problem of the Ministry, with the allied problem of Intercommunion, appears at present to raise an all but insuperable barrier in the way of reunion. The Reformation left the controversy unsolved, and the two sides irreconcilably opposed and persecuting one another; and the substitution of general goodwill for hostility does nothing of itself to overcome the theological difficulty. Yet, since Christ is not divided, there must be an ultimate unity in the truth; and the Anglican communion, which contains in itself representatives of both sides, is assuredly called of God to take a lead in finding the way of unity. Therefore this reply by some leading "Evangelical" theologians to a big book written from the "Catholic" side is important in view of the wider controversy.

The book to which it is a reply was undertaken in the first place because it was felt that, in the light of the fresh study of the doctrine of the Church which is being undertaken in our generation, it was necessary to question the assumption previously current that, whereas the faith of the Church was divine, its order was a matter simply of ecclesiastical law, and that this assumption had coloured most (though by no means all) of the work done on the ministry for half a century. Thus a discontinuity between the Apostolate and the Episcopate had

been discovered by Hatch in his Bampton Lectures of 1880, had been reasserted by Harnack in his theory of the "charismatic ministry," and assumed by most other writers down to Headlam's Bampton Lectures of 1920, the influence of which had been dominant in the period between the wars. We desired to question this presupposition. If the Church is the Body of Christ, should there not be a theological principle discoverable in the ministry of the Church as much as in its faith and sacraments? We believed therefore that a fresh examination of the evidence was necessary; and this examination appeared to give a clue to the problem in the conception of the *Shaliach* or *apostolos*, nowhere more clearly stated than in our Lord's words, "He that receiveth you receiveth me" (Matt. x, 40; Luke x, 16). However much this principle might have been obscured in the course of church history by the secularization of the hierarchy and the growth of prelacy, we believed that it remained as a principle of the pure Gospel underlying the whole idea of the Church's ministry.

Here was the thesis. It would manifestly be unfair to the Evangelical theologians who published these reviews of our book within a few weeks of its first appearance to treat them as more than first impressions; their mature reaction to it will appear, we hope, in due course on a much larger scale. Their first impressions are mainly, though not wholly, unfavourable. They make a large number of criticisms which it is impossible to examine in a brief review, though one cannot pass over a rather radical misconception of the whole idea of the book on the top of p. 18 and the unfair treatment of Fr Thornton on p. 33. We must rather try to see what are the theological issues which arouse misgivings, as these are related to the main Catholic-Protestant controversy.

First, there is the conception of the Apostolic minister as "plenipotentiary"; is our Lord irrevocably bound by His own ordinance (*A.M.*, pp. 22*f.*, 287, etc.), and is the bishop *in some sense* prior to the Church? (*ibid.*, pp. 24-33, etc.) These questions are raised in this volume on pp. 16-17, where the rash conclusion seems to be drawn that whenever a bishop is unfaithful to his trust his people must separate from him, and on p. 37, where it is said that as Judas lost his apostolate, so the validity of the corrupt medieval hierarchy was rightly questioned by the Reformers. One might reply that the ordinance stands even when its holders fall under judgment. But behind all this is the justified Protestant dread lest the hierarchy should be regarded as taking the place of an absent Christ (but *cf.* *A.M.*, p. 522), and lest the bishop's function as in some sense representing Christ should be treated in separation from the Church (*cf.* p. 60 in Canon Greenslade's excellent contribution; *A.M.*, pp. 32, 512, etc.). Yet if the ministry really rests on a theological principle, must it not be regarded as being of the *esse* of the Church and not merely of the *bene esse*?

Second, there is the anxiety that is felt that the positive contribution which Protestantism makes should be duly acknowledged. Do we stand to "Justification by Faith"? (p. 20). This is cardinal. But here one may rightly quote from the report *Catholicity* (in which five out

of eleven authors of the *A.M.* took part) that the trouble comes over the word "alone," and "the full Pauline formula is Justification by the Grace of God, *or*, by the Blood of Christ, through Faith" (*Cath.*, p. 22, note). Is justifying grace mediated through means of grace, or does "faith" stand "alone"? This is the point that underlies *A.M.*, pp. 301 *ff.*

Then there is the question of the positive value and possible validity of Protestant ministries (pp. 21 *ff.*, 39 *f.*, 83). The *crux* of the idea of the Apostolic Succession is that these ministries lie outside it. The reply of *Catholicity* is that we are bound to regard all the existing traditions within Christendom as in various ways defective, and Protestantism happens to be defective in just this way, while its strength lies elsewhere.

Finally, various Anglican precedents are quoted as in line with the South India Scheme (Scottish and Indian, pp. 21-4, English, pp. 81-4). These precedents exist and need to be taken into account. But, since the Anglican tradition also is defective, Anglican precedents are not necessarily decisive in the wider ecumenical context.

The discussion continues.

A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.

Kelham.

Science, Faith and Society. By Michael Polanyi. (Riddell Memorial Lectures.) Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d.

Professor Polanyi is best known, outside the circle of his fellow chemists, as an original and penetrating critic of the quasi-Marxian interpretation of the nature of science and its role in modern society which has been given wide currency (and in some cases brilliant expression) by such men as Hogben, Waddington, Haldane, Bernal and Needham. The title of these Riddell lectures might suggest a further development of the same theme. It is, however, rather misleading, as the greater part of the book is concerned with the epistemology of science, both in its fundamental and in its practical aspects. Professor Polanyi demonstrates neatly, and with the authority of one who was until very recently actively engaged in scientific research, that the methods whereby our knowledge of the physical world is advanced consist not in a cold, rational process of observation and experiment, conducted free from all prepossessions (for without the prepossessions one could not know which observations to note, what experiments to plan, and, even more important, which discrepancies to ignore), but rather in a subtle blend of intuition and sceptical criticism, with the scientist's conscience holding the balance between the two. He next examines the presuppositions on which are based the scientist's views on the nature and role of authority and the moral convictions by which he is, often unconsciously, bound. In the final lecture he examines in the light of this analysis the dilemma of freedom in modern society, and concludes that only by a sense of dedication to his ideals, similar to that displayed over a limited range of experience by the scientist, can man be saved from one servitude or another.

These lectures do not make very light reading, nor have they any very direct relevance to the problems of Christian theology; but they should be read by anyone who wishes to be able to meet the scientific sceptic on his own ground, or who is attempting to form for himself on Christian lines an intellectual synthesis of the modern world. The scientist who is technically proficient but ignorant of and indifferent to the problems and values of humane studies, philosophy and theology, is often held up to obloquy, reasonably enough, as a deplorable product of the disintegration of culture. But the student of the humanities who is complacently or even proudly ignorant not only of the progress but even of the very nature of science is in no better case, and is protected, more often than he deserves, from the finger of scorn simply by the traditional snob-value of his studies. It is important to-day that technologists should not be barbarians, but it is even more important that philosophers and theologians should realize their duty to understand the century in which they live. Professor Polanyi talks to them in their own language and offers them a substantial and original contribution to this neglected aspect of their education.

David A. Webb.

Trinity College,
Dublin.

The Legacy of the Ancient World. By W. G. de Burgh. 3rd ed. Macdonald and Evans. 21s.

The author of this book, first published in 1924, was Professor of Philosophy in Reading University from 1907 to 1934, and was well-known, by his later works—*Towards a Religious Philosophy* (1937), *From Morality to Religion* (Gifford Lectures, 1938), and *Knowledge of the Individual* (Riddell Memorial Lectures, 1939)—as a thinker who maintained that there is no contradiction between reason and revelation. Before his death in 1943 he had completed the preparation of this new edition of *The Legacy of the Ancient World*, which the publishers claim as a third edition, although the "second" was simply a further impression of the first. It has been seen through the press by Mrs de Burgh, who has prefaced it by a gracious Note in which she draws attention to three new appendices designed to amplify the argument and conclusions of the book.

The argument is that the study of history, rightly orientated, leads to a genuinely religious philosophy rather than an ethical humanism: the conclusion, that this is the crying need of the modern, no less than of the ancient world. Thus the author not only gives us a history, but a philosophy of history. The canvas on which he paints is enormous. Beginning with the early civilizations of the East, in Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, the Hittites and the Western Semites, Crete and the Persian Empire, he proceeds to show that the legacy of ancient civilization was bequeathed by three peoples—the Hebrews, the Greeks and the Romans. These three, and their cultures, are considered in greater detail under the following headings: the religion of Israel, the rise of Hellenism, the greatness of Athens, Græco-Macedonian culture, the

Roman Republic and the Roman Empire. A chapter is then devoted to Christianity, its rise, its conflict with pagan religions and Greek philosophy, the emergence of the Catholic faith, the influence of the Roman empire on the Church and the effects of Christianity on the disintegration of that empire, before the author passes on to review its decline and fall, and the legacy in the Middle Ages. The living interest of ancient civilization in the modern world is due to the fact that Israel, Greece and Rome severally stood for one of the essential factors in a complete civilization. Thus, "the vision of a spiritual kingdom, comprising all peoples as its members under God as king; the claim of reason to think, create and act with untrammelled freedom; the recognition of authority and law as necessary instruments to man's conquest over barbarism; these three conceptions, blended in the course of ages with one another and with ideas derived from the races of northern Europe, are acknowledged in their union as the ideal of the modern world" (p. 440). Brave words for 1947, though they may have sounded less strange when first written in 1924.

Yet here lies the chief merit of the book to-day, in that it sets before us, at a time when some Christians are beginning to regard pessimism as fashionable, the belief in a rational purpose governing the course of history, and the deep conviction that "not only religion and morality, but also science and history, rest on the foundations of a reasonable faith" (p. 449).

C. W. Dugmore.
Manchester University.

Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition. By E. G. Rupp. Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d.

"The Reformers are in a fair way to becoming peripheral annotations to the story of the English Reformation." This is the key to five of these nine essays; and the *caveat* is a wise one. There has of late been too much depreciation of personality in favour of "forces," and too much emphasis upon political, social and economic "factors" at the expense of religious conviction. How few English reformers have received satisfactory biographies! Using sources that should be familiar but, like Foxe, are somewhat unfashionable, Mr Rupp writes attractively of such men as Bilney, Frith, Barnes and Roye; Cambridge gets two essays to itself.

Though most of the biographical essays are not more than pleasant sketches, one has a particular point to make. Discussing Bishop Barlow, the author sets out the difficulties which confront any attempt to sort out the various Barlows, and decides that Bishop William Barlow is not identical with the Observantine Friar Jerome, and that the extant recantation signed "William Barlo" was not made by the Bishop who in fact "belongs to the company of Henrician Bishops."

If then these men were really important, what and whence was their creed? Another fashionable trend in recent interpretation of the English Reformation is that the English Church reached 1546 without any (or with scarcely any) change in doctrine. Papal control had gone, monasticism had gone, the English Bible had come—but not heresy.

So for instance Whitney, Constant; Henry and his Henricians kept Reformation doctrines in check. Mr Rupp's remaining essays discuss Lutheran influences in this reign. He does not contest the general truth of the "Henrician" interpretation. As he says, "the evangelical opinions of a small minority of Englishmen had little effect upon high policy." A minority, yes; but if we underrate it, we cannot understand what happened at Henry's death.

A brief essay on Christian obedience examines the ideas of the authority of the State and of the Christian prince current among the earlier English Reformers. Another distinguishes Catholic and Lutheran elements in Marshall's Primer, the Bishop's Book and the King's Book. A third briefly affirms the primacy of *Sola Fide* and is followed by a catena of passages from the Reformers, intended to refute A. H. Rees's contention that the English Reformers taught a Catholic, not a Lutheran, doctrine of justification. Mr Rupp's case is devastating. The remaining and most substantial chapter, Henry VIII and the German Protestants, investigates the years 1536-40, when Henry, for political reasons, came to the verge of a more Protestant position, only to turn away for reasons equally secular. The particular importance of this essay is that it gives the fullest account available in English of the mediating Wittenberg Articles of 1536 which, it is argued, influenced the Ten Articles and Bishop's Book more than Constant allows.

In the course of a decidedly stimulating book, Mr Rupp makes many challenging points. Here are four of them:

1. A purely English reformation developing "on Erasmian lines" from later Lollardy would not have got beyond secondary issues. Luther's influence was decisive. "The death of Bilney marks a stage."
2. Henry's theological knowledge is usually exaggerated.
3. Henry's death *weakened* the cause of Reform by the new instability it engendered. Henry had been about to bring in far-reaching changes. (This needs elaboration.)
4. There is too much talk to-day of the value of being persecuted.

It will be interesting to see how Dr Maynard Smith's promised *Henry VIII and the Reformation* treats some of the issues raised by Mr Rupp.

S. L. Greenslade.

The College,
Durham.

SHORTER NOTICE

The Rationalist Annual for 1948. Watts and Co. 2s. 6d.

Contains, among others, articles by Professor A. J. Ayer on "Some Aspects of Existentialism," by Professor J. B. S. Haldane on "God and Mr C. S. Lewis," and by Dr J. V. Simcox on "Dr G. G. Coulton and the Catholics."

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher